

Do Researchers Consider the Inter-relationship Between Time to Assessment and Admission Severity in Acute Stroke?

Zewen Lu^{1,2}, Matthew Gittins^{1,2}, Amit K Kishore^{2,3}, Craig J Smith^{2,3}, Andy Vail^{1,2}

1 Centre for Biostatistics, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, UK

2 Manchester Centre for Clinical Neurosciences, Geoffrey Jefferson Brain Research Centre, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Salford Care Organisation, Northern Care Alliance NHS Foundation Trust, UK

3 Division of Cardiovascular Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, UK

Abstract

Background: Stroke severity, often quantified by NIHSS at admission, evolves and may influence patients' time to hospital arrival. The inclusion of timing in stroke severity assessment remains unclear in stroke research. Oversight of time to assessment can affect prognostic model interpretation, acute clinical decision-making, and the design of future clinical trials by considering admission severity in the context of time since symptom onset.

Aims: This study aimed to assess whether and, if so, how stroke researchers account for time from symptom onset to admission severity assessment in their analyses. We sought to compare this with approaches used by perinatal researchers, considering a similar statistical relationship between gestational age and birth weight.

Summary of review: Two reviewers systematically reviewed papers in leading specialty journals published in 2019 using NIHSS at admission and birth weight respectively as an explanatory factor in the statistical analysis. We targeted a minimum of 50 articles from each field to ensure 90% to identify approaches used in 5% or more of studies.

A total of 111 studies were included. Perinatal researchers considered the temporal variable gestational age more often than time to assessment in stroke studies (89% vs. 7%, chi-squared $p < 0.001$). It was consequently included more often (56% vs. 5%, chi-squared $p < 0.001$). Four methods, including stratification, distribution, regression and combined approaches, were found. Time to assessment was only included as a continuous ($n=2$) or categorical ($n=1$) factor alongside admission NIHSS in three studies. Methods for covariate selection, essential for the interpretation of statistical models, were rarely specified.

Conclusions: Few researchers explore the inter-relationship between baseline severity and time to assessment in stroke prognostication, in sharp contrast to consideration of timing in perinatal studies. Future research will investigate whether time to assessment or serial NIHSS in the hyper-acute phase could benefit both clinical practice and stroke research.

Keywords: Stroke prognostication; Perinatal prognostication; National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS); Time to assessment; Gestational age; Birth weight

List of Tables

Table 1 Summary of characteristics of included studies.....	12
Table 2 Summary of overall statistical analysis for the included studies.....	13
Table 3 Summary and comparison of methodology to incorporate the dynamic inter-relationship between stroke and perinatal groups.....	14

List of Figures

Figure 1 Flow chart of the study selection	11
Figure 2 Frequency of methodology to incorporate the dynamic inter-relationship between stroke and perinatal groups	14

1 Introduction

Stroke may progress rapidly in the first few hours following ictus, leading to severe complications if left untreated, underscoring the mantra "time is brain" [1]. The severity of stroke on admission to the hospital is typically measured by the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS), a 15-item examination capturing various neurological deficits post-stroke [2 3 4]. Admission severity is a crucial prognostic marker for outcomes such as stroke-associated pneumonia, discharge destination, and functional recovery [5 6 7 8 9]. Adjusting for admission stroke severity is widely recognised for improving model fit and predictive power. [10].

Stroke symptom severity can evolve rapidly, particularly within the first few hours, affecting the recorded severity at the time of hospital admission [11]. Additionally, while all stroke survivors are advised to seek immediate medical attention, actual times to admission vary widely [12]. Patients with more severe symptoms may arrive earlier, suggesting that stroke severity influences the time to assessment.

Given the dynamic nature of stroke progression, incorporating longitudinal designs with repeated measures could enhance prognostication [13 14]. Including a dynamic, time-varying covariate as a fixed baseline measure in statistical models can also lead to biased estimates of patient survival [15]. However, in clinical practice, stroke severity is often recorded only once at admission [16]. This still creates a complexity: controlling for the timing of assessment if the timing itself is influenced by the evolving symptom severity.

We, therefore, systematically reviewed recent high-profile journal publications to determine if, and how, time to assessment is incorporated into studies using admission severity as a prognostic factor. To provide a comparative perspective, we looked at perinatal research, which deals with similar statistical challenges. Perinatal studies frequently examine the relationship between gestational age at delivery and birthweight, akin to the relationship between time to assessment and stroke severity. This field has established robust methods for adjusting for the timing of measurements, such as stratifying outcomes by birthweight and gestational age, including both variables in analyses, and defining birthweight centiles by age [17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26].

Time (gestational age) adjustment in perinatal research allows for a more accurate assessment of a newborn's growth and health status. Given the analogous nature of the data structures—both involving an evolving condition (fetal growth or stroke severity) measured at a time-dependent point (gestational age or time to hospital admission)—it is plausible that similar approaches could be beneficial in stroke research by adequately accounting for the timing of admission severity assessments.

2 Methods

2.1 Study design and aim

We undertook a systematic (protocolised) review of methodology, specifying strict eligibility criteria. Our interest was focused on the statistical approach, if any, taken to address the inter-relationship between the time to assessment (onset to admission time or gestational age) and the realisation of the evolving prognostic factor at that time-point (admission NIHSS or

birthweight). The clinical question and results were not of interest so therefore did not attempt meta-analysis or quality assessment of the included studies.

We followed the PRISMA guidelines to ensure the quality and transparency of reporting of a systematic review [27]. The protocol of this review was prespecified but not registered. It was not published but can be provided if requested.

2.2 Sample size calculation

For comparison of the two research fields, we suspected that the inter-relationship would be considered in at least 80% of the perinatal papers and no more than 20% of stroke papers. Such a difference could be detected with 90% statistical power with only 12 papers from each field. We chose to study 50 from each in order to achieve over 90% power to find a method used in only 5% of papers.

2.3 Search and screening strategy

Based on the sample size calculation, we chose to review leading specialty journals for a single year. We chose 2019 as the most recent year in which the clinical research would not have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. We chose journals based on the ranking of journal citation reports (JCR) 2021 [28] and the number of published articles identified by a keyword search.

The initial searching and eligibility criteria were piloted by two independent reviewers (ZWL and AV). The initial screening was based on searching keywords 'NIHSS OR Severity' in stroke journals and 'Weight OR Birthweight' in perinatal journals. We further screened titles and abstracts to exclude non-clinical and secondary studies.

2.4 Eligibility criteria

We included studies incorporating an analysis of the association between admission severity (or birthweight) and subsequent clinical outcomes, regardless of study design. We excluded studies with fewer than 40 participants as multi-variable regression may not have been appropriate [29]. We also excluded studies that only analysed serial observations of NIHSS (or fetal weight) as such analyses intrinsically recognise the dynamic nature of the prognostic factor using data not available in our motivating context.

2.5 Data extraction and analysis

We extracted data using a bespoke form in Microsoft Excel. We recorded information on publication characteristics, study design and role of admission NIHSS (or birthweight) in the analysis. For method comparison, we also recorded the statistical analysis methods, the outcome of interest, and any covariate selection procedure.

We first summarised the characteristics of the included studies. We compared whether 'time to assessment' (or gestational age) was considered in each study using a simple chi-squared test and catalogued how, noting when multiple eligible approaches were presented. Finally, we tabulated methods of covariate selection as these might have affected the inclusion of the temporal variable 'time to assessment' or 'gestational age'.

3 Results

3.1 Systematic search and study selection

The top two journals in the perinatal field had 132 articles containing our keywords (51 Neonatology; and 81 Journal of Perinatology). We selected the first and sixth journals in the stroke field (32 Stroke; 61 Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Disease) as the intervening journals had lower numbers of such articles. After eligibility screening (Figure 1) we included a total of 111 papers, 54 (49%) studies in the perinatal group and 57 (51%) in the stroke group.

3.2 Study characteristics

The characteristics of the included studies are summarised in Table 1. Both fields were dominated by North American studies. A minority clearly identified a statistician within the authorship, but this was more common in the stroke field. Perinatal studies focused more on risk factor assessment but the majority of papers in each field were accounting for the dynamic marker as a confounder. Studies in stroke were less likely to restrict their eligibility criteria by either factor.

3.3 Methodology comparison

3.3.1 Overall statistical analysis

Both fields reported mostly binary outcome variables and regression models (Table 2). Most studies did not report the methods used to select covariates. For those that did, there was a wide variety of different approaches. Interestingly, the relatively modern statistical approach of propensity score models [^{30 31}] was identified in stroke (three papers) but not perinatal research. Those using this approach all chose to include admission NIHSS as a matching factor. They used matching, inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) or both as the method for estimate adjustment. Only one study included both admission NIHSS and time to admission as matching covariates to estimate the propensity score.

3.3.2 Consideration of dynamic inter-relationship

As anticipated, most papers in the perinatal field (89%) and very few (7%) in stroke indicated some consideration of the inter-relationship by incorporation of the temporal factor alongside the dynamic marker (chi-squared = 71.39, $p < 0.0001$, Table 3). Consequently, the temporal variable was also included more often (56% vs. 5%, chi-squared=31.2, $p < 0.0001$, Table 3). Of only four (7%) papers in the field of stroke that considered time to assessment, one did not retain it, three included it in the statistical analysis using regression methods, two as continuous (assumed linearity) and one as categorical (dichotomised at 360 mins).

In contrast, only six (11%) studies in the perinatal field did not consider gestational age including one that specified the data were unavailable. Those that did used a variety of methods including a simple regression method that treated gestational age as a continuous explanatory factor, centile methods that defined a binary variable as 'small for gestational age' (SGA) or 'large for gestational age' (LGA) in regression, a χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test or just summary statistics of the outcome between two groups by the dichotomised birthweight & GA, SGA and LGA.

4 Discussion

This review has highlighted that researchers in the field of stroke rarely recognise that symptom severity in the hours following a stroke is a dynamic process rather than a fixed baseline characteristic. Despite the critical importance of time to diagnosis and treatment in acute stroke management, the relationship between baseline severity and time to assessment was not widely considered in our review of stroke research [^{32 33}].

The inclusion of time to measurement for diagnostic tools or treatments may depend on its association with patient outcomes [^{34 35}]. We may assume that early diagnoses and treatments lead to a better prognosis. One conventional thinking is that the delay caused by organisational or socioeconomic defects has an adverse impact on patient outcomes. For instance, logistical challenges faced by patients living remotely or alone can delay hospital admission, even amidst acute symptom onset [^{36 37}]. However, the initial assessment of stroke severity cannot diagnose a stroke. Therefore, researchers may not relate time to assessment with patient outcomes. This may explain the lack of attention to incorporating time to assessment or its inter-relationship with admission severity in stroke research.

Besides, the magnitude of association between admission severity and time to assessment is also mild, with a negative linear correlation of -0.2 during the initial 4 hours and tapering to -0.06 thereafter [¹¹]. Contrastingly, in the example of perinatal research, the positive correlation between birthweight and gestational age is stronger and more consistent. Few researchers considering birthweight attempted to do so in the absence of information on gestational age. Extensive research in perinatology has yielded birthweight centile charts, facilitating classifications such as small for gestational age and large for gestational age [^{38 39}]. These charts further account for variables like maternal anthropometrics, parity, and ethnic backgrounds. Furthermore, birth outcomes pivoting around these classifications, both population-centric and custom-tailored, have been comparably studied [^{40 41}]. We are unaware of any corresponding considerations in stroke, such as “mild for 1-hour admission”. This might help better define the dynamic symptom severity, leading to an optimal interpretation of stroke prognostication. However, there is also a lack of evidence in the design of clinical trials or clinical practice to distinguish patients with the same admission NIHSS scores but different assessment/admission times. Trials select eligible patients based solely on admission severity without considering the time of measurements or any changes in symptom severity before randomisation [⁴²].

The procedure of covariate selection may also impact the inclusion of time to measurement in prognostic models. Gestational age is widely considered a prognostic marker in its own right, whereas time to assessment is less recognised as such and rarely included in the table of baseline characteristics. Researchers selecting on the basis of literature review are therefore less likely to include time to assessment as a covariate. Similarly, if researchers select covariates based on their uni-variable statistical significance with outcome, they may be less likely to include time to assessment due to the weaker relationship. It is less clear what the effect of stepwise selection strategies may be. The weaker association between time to assessment and subsequent outcome may lead to exclusion. On the other hand, gestational age may also be excluded due to high correlation and multicollinearity with birthweight. The choice of the threshold of p-value in the stepwise selection and univariable analysis plays an important role in the temporal variable to be included in the multivariable model. Despite its central role, most studies in this review did not specify the method of covariate selection.

We restricted our review to only two leading journals in each group for a single year. We make no claim that this review is comprehensive nor do we seek to estimate the exact

proportion or difference in the proportion of researchers considering the temporal variables between the stroke and perinatal fields. However, we deem it unlikely that more sophisticated methods of analysis would be employed in journals of lower citation rank. Equally, this is not a comprehensive review of the methods available to incorporate the inter-relationship of either gestational age and birthweight or time to assessment and admission severity. Although the sample size calculation ensures a high chance of finding methods applied in these fields, other methods may be applied elsewhere or developed in the statistical literature but yet to be applied.

5 Conclusion

The timing of admission severity is rarely considered in stroke, in sharp contrast to the timing of birthweight in the perinatal field. Given the dynamic state of symptom severity, clinicians may consider admission severity in the context of time since symptom onset and the value of repeat NIHSS assessment before the end of any time window for acute intervention. For epidemiologists, there may be reasonable statistical justification for this lack of consideration related to the inconsistency of the evolution of symptoms in the hours following stroke and the strength and shape of the relationship between this evolution and clinical outcomes. However, with a better understanding of these factors, there is potential to improve both clinical care and stroke research.

References

1. Saver JL. Time is brain--quantified. *Stroke* 2006; 37: 263–266.
2. Chalos V, van der Ende NAM, Lingsma HF, et al. National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale. *Stroke* 2020; 51: 282–290.
3. T B, Hp A, Cp O, et al. Measurements of acute cerebral infarction: a clinical examination scale. *Stroke*; 20. Epub ahead of print July 1989. DOI: 10.1161/01.str.20.7.864.
4. Lyden P. Using the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale: A Cautionary Tale. *Stroke* 2017; 48: 513–519.
5. Weimar C, Ziegler A, König IR, et al. Predicting functional outcome and survival after acute ischemic stroke. *J Neurol* 2002; 249: 888–895.
6. Berker H de, Berker A de, Aung H, et al. Pre-stroke disability and stroke severity as predictors of discharge destination from an acute stroke ward. *Clinical Medicine* 2021; 21: e186–e191.
7. Kishore AK, Vail A, Bray BD, et al. Clinical risk scores for predicting stroke-associated pneumonia: A systematic review. *Eur Stroke J* 2016; 1: 76–84.
8. Smith CJ, Bray BD, Hoffman A, et al. Can a Novel Clinical Risk Score Improve Pneumonia Prediction in Acute Stroke Care? A UK Multicenter Cohort Study. *Journal of the American Heart Association*; 4: e001307.
9. R M, J van L, B K, et al. Prognostic social factors in the subacute phase after a stroke for the discharge destination from the hospital stroke-unit. A systematic review of the literature. *Disability and rehabilitation*; 26. Epub ahead of print 18 February 2004. DOI: 10.1080/09638280310001636437.
10. Fonarow GC, Pan W, Saver JL, et al. Comparison of 30-Day Mortality Models for Profiling Hospital Performance in Acute Ischemic Stroke With vs Without Adjustment for Stroke Severity. *JAMA* 2012; 308: 257–264.
11. Naess H, Kurtz M, Thomassen L, et al. Serial NIHSS scores in patients with acute cerebral infarction. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica* 2016; 133: 415–420.
12. Feldmann E, Gordon N, Brooks JM, et al. Factors associated with early presentation of acute stroke. *Stroke* 1993; 24: 1805–1810.
13. Du J, Wang Y, Che B, et al. The relationship between neurological function trajectory, assessed by repeated NIHSS measurement, and long-term cardiovascular events, recurrent stroke, and mortality after ischemic stroke. *International Journal of Stroke* 2023; 18: 1005–1014.
14. Sajobi TT, Menon BK, Wang M, et al. Early Trajectory of Stroke Severity Predicts Long-Term Functional Outcomes in Ischemic Stroke Subjects. *Stroke*. Epub ahead of print January 2017. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.014456.

15. Wolkewitz M, Allignol A, Harbarth S, et al. Time-dependent study entries and exposures in cohort studies can easily be sources of different and avoidable types of bias. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2012; 65: 1171–1180.
16. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, et al. Guidelines for the Early Management of Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke: 2019 Update to the 2018 Guidelines for the Early Management of Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Guideline for Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. Epub ahead of print December 2019. DOI: 10.1161/STR.000000000000211.
17. Vangen S, Stoltenberg C, Skjaerven R, et al. The heavier the better? Birthweight and perinatal mortality in different ethnic groups. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2002; 31: 654–660.
18. Land JA. How should we report on perinatal outcome? *Human Reproduction* 2006; 21: 2638–2639.
19. Yerushalmy J. The classification of newborn infants by birth weight and gestational age. *The Journal of Pediatrics* 1967; 71: 164–172.
20. Ausbeck EB, Allman PH, Szychowski JM, et al. 1000: Gestational age versus birthweight to predict outcomes in neonates with extreme prematurity. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology* 2020; 222: S621–S622.
21. Salas AA, Carlo WA, Ambalavanan N, et al. Gestational age and birthweight for risk assessment of neurodevelopmental impairment or death in extremely preterm infants. *Archives of Disease in Childhood - Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2016; 101: F494–F501.
22. Wilcox AJ, Skjaerven R. Birth weight and perinatal mortality: the effect of gestational age. *Am J Public Health* 1992; 82: 378–382.
23. Wright EM, Royston P. A Comparison of Statistical Methods for Age-related Reference Intervals. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 1997; 160: 47–69.
24. Villar J, Papageorgiou AT, Pang R, et al. The likeness of fetal growth and newborn size across non-isolated populations in the INTERGROWTH-21st Project: the Fetal Growth Longitudinal Study and Newborn Cross-Sectional Study. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology* 2014; 2: 781–792.
25. Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, et al. Establishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. *BMJ* 2000; 320: 1240.
26. Cole TJ, Green PJ. Smoothing reference centile curves: the LMS method and penalized likelihood. *Stat Med* 1992; 11: 1305–1319.
27. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2009; 151: W-65.

28. Journal Citations Reports JCR. *Clarivate*, <https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic-research/research-analytics-evaluation-and-management-solutions/journal-citation-reports/> (accessed 21 September 2023).
29. Altman DG. *Practical Statistics for Medical Research*. CRC Press, 1990.
30. Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects. *Biometrika* 1983; 70: 41–55.
31. Weitzen S, Lapane KL, Toledano AY, et al. Principles for modeling propensity scores in medical research: a systematic literature review. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 2004; 13: 841–853.
32. Jahan R, Saver JL, Schwamm LH, et al. Association Between Time to Treatment With Endovascular Reperfusion Therapy and Outcomes in Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke Treated in Clinical Practice. *JAMA* 2019; 322: 252–263.
33. Fonarow GC, Smith EE, Saver JL, et al. Improving Door-to-Needle Times in Acute Ischemic Stroke. *Stroke*. Epub ahead of print October 2011. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.621342.
34. Launay E, Morfouace M, Deneux-Tharaux C, et al. Quality of reporting of studies evaluating time to diagnosis: a systematic review in paediatrics. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2014; 99: 244–250.
35. Launay E, Cohen JF, Bossuyt PM, et al. Reporting studies on time to diagnosis: proposal of a guideline by an international panel (REST). *BMC Med* 2016; 14: 1–7.
36. Jørgensen HS, Nakayama H, Reith J, et al. Factors delaying hospital admission in acute stroke: the Copenhagen Stroke Study. *Neurology* 1996; 47: 383–387.
37. Wester P, Rådberg J, Lundgren B, et al. Factors Associated With Delayed Admission to Hospital and In-Hospital Delays in Acute Stroke and TIA. *Stroke* 1999; 30: 40–48.
38. Galvão RB, Souza RT, Vieira MC, et al. Performances of birthweight charts to predict adverse perinatal outcomes related to SGA in a cohort of nulliparas. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2022; 22: 615.
39. Ota E, Ganchimeg T, Morisaki N, et al. Risk Factors and Adverse Perinatal Outcomes among Term and Preterm Infants Born Small-for-Gestational-Age: Secondary Analyses of the WHO Multi-Country Survey on Maternal and Newborn Health. *PLOS ONE* 2014; 9: e105155.
40. Iliodromiti S, Mackay DF, Smith GCS, et al. Customised and Noncustomised Birth Weight Centiles and Prediction of Stillbirth and Infant Mortality and Morbidity: A Cohort Study of 979,912 Term Singleton Pregnancies in Scotland. *PLOS Medicine* 2017; 14: e1002228.
41. Sovio U, Smith GCS. The effect of customization and use of a fetal growth standard on the association between birthweight percentile and adverse perinatal outcome. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2018; 218: S738–S744.

42. Berkhemer OA, Fransen PSS, Beumer D, et al. A Randomized Trial of Intraarterial Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2015; 372: 11–20.




Figure 1 Flow chart of the study selection

Table 1 Summary of characteristics of included studies

Characteristics	Number (Percent %)	
	Stroke n=57	Perinatal n=54
Region of the study		
Asia	11 (19%)	5 (9%)
North America	29 (50%)	34 (62%)
Europe	12 (22%)	12 (23%)
Others	5 (9%)	3 (6%)
Statistician(s) involved as co-author(s)		
Yes	20 (35%)	12 (22%)
No	37 (65%)	42 (78%)
Aim of the study		
Prediction	17 (30%)	5 (9%)
Risk factor	30 (53%)	49 (91%)
Not clear	10 (17%)	0 (0%)
Study design		
Retrospective cohort study	31 (54%)	36 (67%)
Prospective cohort study	16 (28%)	10 (19%)
Case control study	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Reanalysis of data from RCT	8 (14%)	0 (0%)
RCT	1 (2%)	3 (5%)
Retrospective case series study	0 (0%)	4 (7%)
Study population		
No restriction	37 (65%)	10 (19%)
Restricted by NIHSS/birthweight	4 (7%)	18 (33%)
Restricted by TTA/GA	12 (21%)	13 (24%)
Restricted by both variables	4 (7%)	13 (24%)
Role of NIHSS/Birthweight		
Confounder	29 (51%)	29 (54%)
Factor of interest	24 (42%)	19 (35%)
Not clear	4 (7%)	6 (11%)

Table 2 Summary of overall statistical analysis for the included studies

Statistical analysis	Number (Percent %)	
	Stroke n=57	Perinatal n=54
Outcomes		
Multiple	8 (14%)	4 (7%)
Continuous	5 (9%)	14 (26%)
Binary	43 (75%)	34 (63%)
Ordinal	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Time to event	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Statistical analysis		
Matched in design	2 (4%)	0 (0%)
Included in regression	52 (90%)	44 (81%)
Both design and regression	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Statistical test	1 (2%)	8 (15%)
Summary statistics	1 (2%)	2 (4%)
Covariate Selection		
Baseline characteristics	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Literature review and clinical relevance	3 (5%)	2 (4%)
Stepwise forward selection	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Stepwise backward selection	5 (9%)	2 (4%)
Bi-directional stepwise selection	2 (4%)	1 (2%)
Univariable analysis	13 (23%)	4 (7%)
Multistage selection	5 (8%)	5 (9%)
Unspecified	27 (47%)	38 (70%)

Table 3 Summary and comparison of methodology to incorporate the dynamic inter-relationship between stroke and perinatal groups

Methodology	Number (Percent %)	
	Stroke n=57	Perinatal n=54
No consideration	53 (93%)	6 (11%)
Considered but not included	1 (2%)	18 (33%)
No multivariable analysis	0 (0%)	6 (11%)
Not included in multivariable analysis	1 (2%)	12 (22%)
Included	3 (5%)	30 (56%)
Stratification method	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Distributional methods (parametric)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Distributional methods (non-parametric)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)
Regression methods (continuous)	2 (3%)	18 (33%)
Regression methods (categorical)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Regression and distribution (centile only)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Regression and distribution (centile and gestation age)	0 (0%)	8 (15%)




Figure 2 Frequency of methodology to incorporate the dynamic inter-relationship between stroke and perinatal groups